

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDWARD G. STINSON,

Petitioner,

v.

BOARD OF PRISON TERMS, et al.,

Respondents.

No. C 07-0282 MMC (PR)

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S
REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME**

(Docket No. 7)


On January 17, 2007, petitioner, a California prisoner proceeding pro se, filed the above-titled petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On June 22, 2007, the Court ordered respondent to show cause why the petition should not be granted. According to the briefing schedule set forth in the order to show cause, respondent must file an answer to the petition on or before September 22, 2007.

Now before the Court is petitioner's motion for an enlargement of time to reply to respondent's answer to the petition. The motion is premature, however, because respondent has not filed an answer yet. Accordingly, petitioner's motion is DENIED. As set forth in the briefing schedule in the order to show cause, if petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the Court and serving it on respondent within thirty days of the date the answer is filed.

This order terminates Docket No. 7.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 1, 2007


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge